

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/489,895 First Named Applicant: Jorg HENKEL
 Examiner: Dwin CRAIG Art Unit: 2123 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

- (1) Examiner Craig (2) Paul J. Wilson
 (3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: July 29, 2004 Proposed Time: 10 AM (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested: (1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☒ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit to Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, provide brief description: _____

RECEIVED

JUL 20 2004

Technology Center 2100

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rejection</u>	<u>2, 3</u>	<u>USP 6,622,287</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>Rejection</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>See Cont. Sheet</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

- (1) USP 6,622,287 does not teach or suggest the circuit model instructions of the '895 application
 (2) See Continuation Sheet

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Paul J. Wilson Reg. No. 95,879
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)
 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Continuation Sheet to Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form
U.S. Application No. 09/489,895
Examiner: Dwin CRAIG
Art Unit: 2123

Issues To Be Discussed:

(2) The rejections of claims 1-8 based on Kageshima *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,096,089) in view of Catthoor *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,274) and in further view of Allen *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,568) and other prior art.

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

(2) As discussed in the Rule 111 Amendment filed on June 22, 2004, the combination of Kageshima, Catthoor *et al.* and Allen *et al.* does not teach or suggest a determination of whether an initially defined instruction set has data dependencies or correlation between instructions, and thence modifying the defined instruction set based on the determination. The Patent Office has acknowledged that the combination of Kageshima and Catthoor *et al.* does not expressly disclose at least the determination of data dependencies or correlation between instructions of an initially defined instruction set and decreasing the complexity of the initially defined instruction set based on that determination. Allen *et al.* disclose, *inter alia*, that if the power consumption estimation is not satisfactory, changes to the architectural description or other parameters can be implemented and the power consumption estimation re-executed. See, e.g., col. 4, lines 35-42; col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 3 of Allen *et al.* A more detailed review of Allen *et al.* does not reveal any further teaching or suggestion of refinement of an initial instruction set based on data dependencies or correlation between instructions of the initially defined instruction set.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY